

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON

SACIA E. RUTLEDGE,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 3:18-cv-49

vs.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

Magistrate Judge Michael J. Newman  
(Consent Case)

Defendant.

---

**DECISION AND ENTRY: (1) AFFIRMING THE ALJ’S NON-DISABILITY FINDING;  
AND (2) TERMINATING THIS CASE**

---

This Social Security disability benefits appeal is before the undersigned for disposition based upon the parties’ consent. Doc. 11. At issue is whether the Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) erred in finding Plaintiff not “disabled” and therefore unentitled to Disability Insurance Benefits (“DIB”) and/or Supplemental Security Income (“SSI”).<sup>1</sup> This case is before the Court on Plaintiff’s Statement of Errors (doc. 14), the Commissioner’s memorandum in opposition (doc. 16), Plaintiff’s reply (doc. 18), the administrative record (doc. 7),<sup>2</sup> and the record as a whole.

**I.**

**A. Procedural History**

Plaintiff filed for DIB and SSI alleging a disability onset date of November 7, 2007. PageID 206-15. Plaintiff claims disability as a result of a number of alleged impairments including, *inter alia*, right knee chondromalacia<sup>3</sup> and migraines. PageID 482.

---

<sup>1</sup> “The Commissioner’s regulations governing the evaluation of disability for DIB and SSI are identical . . . and are found at 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520, and 20 C.F.R. § 416.920 respectively.” *Colvin v. Barnhart*, 475 F.3d 727, 730 (6th Cir. 2007). Citations in this Decision and Entry to DIB regulations are made with full knowledge of the corresponding SSI regulations, and *vice versa*.

<sup>2</sup> Hereafter, citations to the electronically-filed administrative record will refer only to the PageID.

<sup>3</sup> “Chondromalacia is irritation of the undersurface of the knee cap caused by the knee cap rubbing against one side of the knee joint.” *Roberts v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 3:10CV-23, 2011 WL 798138, at \*4 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 1, 2011).

After an initial denial of her application, Plaintiff received a hearing before ALJ Mary Withum on December 7, 2012. PageID 84-111. ALJ Withum issued a written decision on January 19, 2013 finding Plaintiff not disabled. PageID 63-77. After the Appeals Council denied Plaintiff's request for review, Plaintiff appealed to this Court. PageID 49. Following the filing of the parties' joint stipulation for remand, the Court reversed ALJ Withum's non-disability finding and remanded the case for further proceedings. PageID 1337.

On remand, the Appeals Council returned the matter to an ALJ for resolution. PageID 1337-38. ALJ Mark Hockensmith held a hearing on September 14, 2016, and issued a decision finding Plaintiff not disabled on December 8, 2016. PageID 1228-47, 1256-99. Specifically, ALJ Hockensmith found at Step Five that, based upon Plaintiff's residual functional capacity ("RFC") to perform a reduced range of light work,<sup>4</sup> "there are jobs that exist in significant numbers in the national economy that [Plaintiff] can perform[.]" PageID 1238-47. Thereafter, the Appeals Council denied Plaintiff's request for review, making ALJ Hockensmith's non-disability finding the final administrative decision of the Commissioner. PageID 1216. *See Casey v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 987 F.2d 1230, 1233 (6th Cir. 1993). Plaintiff then filed this timely appeal. *Cook v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 480 F.3d 432, 435 (6th Cir. 2007). The non-disability finding by ALJ Hockensmith (hereinafter, "ALJ") is now before the Court for review.

## **B. Evidence of Record**

The evidence of record is adequately summarized in the ALJ's decision (PageID 1228-47), Plaintiff's Statement of Errors (doc. 14), the Commissioner's memorandum in opposition (doc.

---

<sup>4</sup> Light work "involves lifting no more than 20 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 10 pounds" and "requires a good deal of walking or standing, or . . . sitting most of the time with some pushing and pulling of arm or leg controls." *Id.* § 404.1567(b). An individual who can perform light work is presumed also able to perform sedentary work. *Id.* Sedentary work "involves lifting no more than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers, and small tools. Although a sedentary job is defined as one which involves sitting, a certain amount of walking and standing is often necessary in carrying out job duties." *Id.* § 404.1567(a).

16), and Plaintiff's reply (doc. 18). The undersigned incorporates all of the foregoing and sets forth the facts relevant to this appeal herein.

## **II.**

### **A. Standard of Review**

The Court's inquiry on a Social Security appeal is to determine (1) whether the ALJ's non-disability finding is supported by substantial evidence, and (2) whether the ALJ employed the correct legal criteria. 42 U.S.C. § 405(g); *Bowen v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 478 F.3d 742, 745-46 (6th Cir. 2007). In performing this review, the Court must consider the record as a whole. *Hephner v. Mathews*, 574 F.2d 359, 362 (6th Cir. 1978).

Substantial evidence is "such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion." *Richardson v. Perales*, 402 U.S. 389, 401 (1971). When substantial evidence supports the ALJ's denial of benefits, that finding must be affirmed, even if substantial evidence also exists in the record upon which the ALJ could have found Plaintiff disabled. *Buxton v. Halter*, 246 F.3d 762, 772 (6th Cir. 2001). Thus, the ALJ has a "'zone of choice' within which he [or she] can act without the fear of court interference." *Id.* at 773.

The second judicial inquiry -- reviewing the correctness of the ALJ's legal analysis -- may result in reversal even if the ALJ's decision is supported by substantial evidence in the record. *Rabbers v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 582 F.3d 647, 651 (6th Cir. 2009). "[A] decision of the Commissioner will not be upheld where the [Social Security Administration] fails to follow its own regulations and where that error prejudices a claimant on the merits or deprives the claimant of a substantial right." *Bowen*, 478 F.3d at 746.

### **B. "Disability" Defined**

To be eligible for disability benefits, a claimant must be under a "disability" as defined by the Social Security Act. 42 U.S.C. § 423(d)(1)(A). Narrowed to its statutory meaning, a

“disability” includes physical and/or mental impairments that are both “medically determinable” and severe enough to prevent a claimant from (1) performing his or her past job and (2) engaging in “substantial gainful activity” that is available in the regional or national economies. *Id.*

Administrative regulations require a five-step sequential evaluation for disability determinations. 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520(a)(4). Although a dispositive finding at any step ends the ALJ’s review, *see Colvin v. Barnhart*, 475 F.3d 727, 730 (6th Cir. 2007), the complete sequential review poses five questions:

1. Has the claimant engaged in substantial gainful activity;
2. Does the claimant suffer from one or more severe impairments;
3. Do the claimant’s severe impairments, alone or in combination, meet or equal the criteria of an impairment set forth in the Commissioner’s Listing of Impairments (the “Listings”), 20 C.F.R. Subpart P, Appendix 1;
4. Considering the claimant’s RFC, can he or she perform his or her past relevant work; and
5. Assuming the claimant can no longer perform his or her past relevant work -- and also considering the claimant’s age, education, past work experience, and RFC -- do significant numbers of other jobs exist in the national economy which the claimant can perform?

20 C.F.R. § 404.1520(a)(4); *see also Miller v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, 181 F. Supp.2d 816, 818 (S.D. Ohio 2001). A claimant bears the ultimate burden of establishing disability under the Social Security Act’s definition. *Key v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, 109 F.3d 270, 274 (6th Cir. 1997).

### III.

In her Statement of Errors, Plaintiff argues that the ALJ erred in: (1) evaluating medical evidence and medical source opinions; and (2) assessing the severity of her symptoms. Doc. 14. Having carefully reviewed the administrative record and the parties’ briefs, and also having carefully considered the ALJ’s analysis leading to the non-disability finding here at issue, the Court finds the ALJ carefully and reasonably developed and reviewed the record; appropriately

considered the medical evidence at issue; properly weighed opinion evidence based upon reasons supported by substantial evidence (including the opinions of Kwasi Nennonene, M.D. and Morris Brown, M.D.); reasonably assessed Plaintiff's credibility; posed appropriate hypothetical questions to the VE; accurately determined Plaintiff's RFC; and appropriately concluded, at Step Five (and in reliance on the VE's sworn testimony), that Plaintiff can perform a significant number of jobs in the national economy.

Accordingly, the Court **AFFIRMS** the ALJ's non-disability finding as supported by substantial evidence, and **TERMINATES** this case on the Court's docket.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date: April 5, 2019

s/ Michael J. Newman  
Michael J. Newman  
United States Magistrate Judge